

### **Remarks**

In response to the Office Action mailed April 24, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. In the present application, claims 33, 42, and 52 have been amended. The claims have been amended to clarify that the second telecommunications device is associated with a called party and is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with the Internet-accessible device, the information determined by the first module comprises a name and a directory number of the calling party, the node accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module, and the first module and the second module are colocated within the node. Support for the claim amendments may be found on page 11, lines 16-20, page 13, lines 2-5, page 15, lines 15-18, and on page 16, lines 12-15 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 33 and 37-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams et al. (US 6,816,481, hereinafter "Adams"). Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Devillier (US 5,850,435).

### **Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview**

A brief telephonic interview between the undersigned and the Examiner was held on July 20, 2006 to discuss the rejection of independent claim 33 in view of the Adams reference. In the interview, the undersigned pointed out that Adams fails to show modules which are colocated within a node. The Examiner agreed and further suggested clarifying the claims to identify the information stored in the modules and distinguishing this information from the information stored in the LIDB and the registration server (the alleged modules) of Adams which were discussed in the Office Action.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 33 and 37-52 are rejected as being anticipated by Adams. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 33 specifies a system for notifying an Internet-accessible device of a communication placed from a first telecommunications device to a second telecommunications device by a calling party. The system includes a switch for detecting the communication; and a node in communication with the switch, wherein the node is configured for communicating information associated with the first telecommunications device to the Internet-accessible device over the Internet, wherein the second telecommunications device is associated with a called party and is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with the Internet-accessible device. The node includes a first module for determining information about the calling party utilizing the first telecommunication device, wherein the information comprises a name and a directory number of the calling party; and a second module for determining information about the Internet-accessible device, wherein the node accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module and wherein the first module and the second module are colocated within the node.

It is respectfully submitted that Adams fails to teach each and every feature specified in claim 33. For example, Adams fails to teach the second telecommunications device is associated with a called party and is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with the Internet-accessible device, the information determined by the first module comprises a name and a directory number of the calling party, the node accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module, and the

first module and the second module are colocated within the node. Instead, Adams discloses subscriber phone 18 and an ICW subscriber PC 25 which is on the same communications line to the SSP 20 (see Figure 1). Thus, Adams fails to disclose a separate communications line. Furthermore, Adams discloses an LIDB database 50 (alleged in the Office Action to be the “first module” – see Figure 1) which is used by an ISCP 40 to retrieve calling party name information associated with the calling party’s number for transmission to a subscriber. The ISCP 40 has already determined the line number of the calling party before the LIDB 50 is accessed (see col. 6, line 66 through col. 7, lines 1-9). Thus, Adams fails to disclose that both the name and the directory number of the calling party are determined from the LIDB 50, which is contrary to amended independent claim 33. Furthermore, the Office Action alleges Adams discloses node (the ISCP 40), a first module (the LIDB 50), and a second module (the registration server 80) – see Figure 1. However, Adams fails to disclose that the ISCP 40 accesses the LIDB 50 (first module) prior to accessing the registration server 80 (second module). Instead, Adams specifically points out that the registration server 80 is the first database accessed by the ISCP 40. Adams also fails to disclose that the LIDB 50 and the registration server 80 are colocated within the ISCP 40 (in Adams, the LIDB 50 and the registration server 80 are external to and thus are not colocated within the ISCP 40).

Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 33 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 37-41 depend from claim 33 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claims 42 and 52 recite similar features as those found in amended independent claim 33 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 43-51 depend from claim 42 and are allowable for

at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 37-52 should also be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 34-36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Devillier. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 34-36 depend from amended independent claim 33 and thus specify at least the same features. As discussed above, Adams fails to disclose each of the features specified in claim 33. Devillier, relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Adams merely discloses the use of a wireless telephone set for receiving caller ID information. Thus, Devillier, like Adams, fails to disclose at least the following features: the second telecommunications device is associated with a called party and is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with the Internet-accessible device, the information determined by the first module comprises a name and a directory number of the calling party, the node accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module, and the first module and the second module are colocated within the node. Accordingly, claims 34-36 are allowable over the combination of Adams and Devillier and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: July 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/  
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, GA 30007-1355  
(404) 849-2093